UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/681,121	10/09/2003	Han Moon	0465-1051P	8086

2292 7590 09/21/2007
BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH
PO BOX 747
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747

EXAMINER	
OKORONKWO, CHINWENDU C	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2136	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
09/21/2007	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mailroom@bskb.com

Office Action Summary	**Application No.** 10/681,121	**Applicant(s)** MOON, HAN	
	Examiner Chinwendu C. Okoronkwo	**Art Unit** 2136	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *26 June 2007*.
2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1 and 3-20* is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6)☒ Claim(s) *1 and 3-20* is/are rejected.
7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
PTOL-326 (Rev. 08-06) Office Action Summary Part of Paper No./Mail Date 20070914

DETAILED ACTION

Priority

1. The Examiner acknowledges the foreign priority and agrees that the previous statement about a certified translation being necessary in incorrect.

Response to Remarks/Arguments

1. In response to communications filed on 03/27/2007, applicant amends claims 1, 3-10; cancels claim 2; and adds claims 11-20. The following claims, claims 1, 3-20, are presented for examination.

1.1 Applicant's arguments, pages 14-19, with respect to the rejection of claims 1, 3-20 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

1.2 In response to Applicant argument that the Iwafune reference does not teach or suggest a user code input with user ID and password, the Examiner respectfully disagrees citing column 2 lines 32-46, col. 18 lines 61-67 and column 19 lines 1-25 which clearly discloses, "an authentication information database ... [comprising] user identifier indicating a user" and "personal ID for specifying a viewer who inputs response data when ... a plurality of persons." The personal ID in combination with the disclosed user identifier are analogous in functionality as the claimed user ID and password of the instant application. Therefore the rejection is maintained.

1.3 In response to Applicant argument that the Iwafune reference does not teach or suggest elements e and f of claim 6, elements f and g of claim 7 and elements of claim 9, the Examiner respectfully disagrees citing, in addition to the previously cited column 19 lines 36-47, column 6 lines 38-50 and column 6 lines 59-65 of Iwafune which clearly discloses, "an interactive television program to prompt a viewer to input a response, the viewer inputs a response (sequence of keys) by using the remote control switch. The television program control unit receives the viewer response from the channel tuning and response identification circuit and forms response data by adding to the response the television program ID of the television program and the television ID of the interactive television." Iwafune then discloses transferring the input data by means of a "communication control unit [which] connects the response server [(broadcasting station)] to the interactive televisions (col. 7 lines 25-35)." Based upon this disclosure the Examiner maintains the rejection.

Information Disclosure Statement

2. For the record, the Examiner acknowledges that no IDS have yet to be received with this application submitted on 10/09/2003.

Oath/Declaration

3. For the record, the Examiner acknowledges that the Oath/Declaration submitted on 03/21/2004 has been received and considered.

Drawings

4. For the record, the Examiner acknowledges that the drawings submitted on 10/09/2003 have been received, considered.

Specification

5. For the record, the Examiner acknowledges that the Specification submitted on 10/09/2003 has been received and considered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

6. The Examiner acknowledges the cancellation of claim 2 and thus the 112 second paragraph rejection of claim has been overcome.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

7. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The claims are directed toward "a user certificate method for data broadcasting." It is unclear how these claims can be directed towards both a user certificate and a method simultaneously. It is understood within the art to direct claims towards a user certificate used in data broadcasting or towards a method for data broadcasting, but not both simultaneously.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

8. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being disclosed by Iwafune et al. (US Patent No. 5,880,720)

Regarding claim 1, Iwafune et al., discloses a user certificate method for data broadcasting comprising the steps of:

- inputting a code recollection starting key on a remote control device during a user watches a data broadcasting (Figure 17 and col. 16 lines 1-16);
- extracting a program title from an Electronic Program Guide table received from a broadcasting station in response to the input code collection starting key (col. 7 lines 8-17);
- inputting on the remote control device a sequence of keys for user certification, wherein the sequence of the keys includes a user ID and a password (col. 2 lines 32-46);

- inputting a code collection end key on the remote control device after the inputting of the sequence of keys is finished (Figure 17 and col. 16 lines 1-16);
- inputting, by the user, a user code after inputting the code collection end key (col. 2 lines 32-46, col. 18 lines 61-67 and col. 19 lines 1-25); and
- storing a record having the user code, the program title and the sequence of keys in a code certificate table, whereby the user code can be used to retrieve the user ID and password associated with the user code for user certification (col. 6 lines 38-50, col. 6 lines 59-65 and col. 19 lines 35-47).

Regarding claim 3, Iwafune et al., discloses the method as claimed in claim 1, further comprising the steps of:

- querying whether the user uses the same user ID and password for all broadcasting programs (col. 20 lines 11-27); and
- setting a flag representing use of the same user ID and password for all the broadcasting programs if thw querying step indicates that the same user ID and password are to be used for all broadcasting programs (Figure 17 and col. 19 lines 5-18).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 4-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Iwafune et al. (US Patent No. 5,880,720) and further in view of Sakata (US Patent No. 7,110,018).

Regarding claim 4 and 11, Iwafune et al., discloses a user certificate method for data broadcasting comprising the steps of:

(b) inputting, by a user, a user code after the code shortcut key is inputted (col. 2 lines 32-46, col. 18 lines 61-67 and col. 19 lines 1-25);

(c) determining existence of the input user code in a code certificate table (col. 6 lines 38-50, col. 6 lines 59-65 and col. 19 lines 35-47);

(d) if the input user code exists in the code certificate table, reading program titles associated with the user code from the code certificate table, and determining whether any program title associated with the user code is the same as the program title of a program being watched by the user (col. 19 lines 36-47 and col. 20 lines 11-27);

(e) if same program title exists, reading sequence of keys associated with the user code and the program title from the code certificate table, wherein the sequence of keys includes a user ID and a password (col. 19 lines 36-47); and

(f) transferring the user ID and the password of the sequence of keys associated with the user code to a broadcasting station (col. 20 lines 11-27).

Iwafune et al. is silent in disclosing inputting a code shortcut key on a remote control device while watching data broadcasting (he does implicitly hint towards such an analogous element in column 18 lines 19-23), however, Sakata does disclose such a limitation (col. 1 lines 26-37, specifically lines 31-34 of Sakata).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention to combine the television system of Iwafune et al. with the communication terminal of Sakata. Sakata provides motivation for this combination in the recitation of the "since a remote controller is used as the main control system of each device, it is unsuitable for complicated input operation ... the operability of the input is bad." Therefore, motivation for modifying the television system of Iwafune et al. and its remote control (Figure 17) with the communication terminal of Sakata and its remote control (col. 1 lines 31-34) is clear. The shortcut key of the remote controller disclosed by Sakata would benefit the television system of Iwafune et al. in that the television remote control would be able to handled "complicated input" such as the key sequence claimed within the instant application.

Regarding claim 5, Iwafune et al., is silent in disclosing the method as claimed in claim 4, further comprising the step of displaying a message on a screen that indicates non-existence of the user code that is input by the user in a case where there is no user code in the code certificate table that matches the user code input by the user as a result of the determination in step (c). However, it would have been obvious to provide a non-affirmative response/message to the user if a transaction does not complete as intended. Iwafune et al. provides motivation for the obviousness modification reasoning in the recitation of col. 17 lines 62-65 in which a screen is displayed after transaction establishment information is received, which can contain either be a positive or negative message. Therefore, motivation for modifying the television system of Iwafune et al. is clear. Such a message would benefit the television system of Iwafune et al. by increasing user satisfaction - keeping users informed of the status of operations – thus making the system as a whole more user friendly.

Regarding claim 6, Iwafune et al., is silent in disclosing the user method as claimed in claim 4, further comprising the step of displaying a message on a screen that indicates no program title associated with the user code is the same as the program title being watched by the use in a case where there is no same program as a result of the determination in step (d). However, it would have been obvious to provide a non-affirmative response/message to the user if a transaction does not complete as intended. Iwafune et al. provides motivation for the obviousness modification reasoning in the recitation of col. 17 lines 62-65 in which a screen is displayed after transaction establishment information is received, which can contain either be a positive or negative message. Therefore, motivation for modifying the television system of Iwafune et al. is clear. Such a message would benefit the television system of Iwafune et al. by increasing user satisfaction - keeping users informed of the status of operations – thus making the system as a whole more user friendly.

Regarding claim 7, Iwafune et al., discloses the certificate method for data broadcasting comprising the steps of:

(b) inputting a user code according to a screen displayed after the code shortcut key is inputted (col. 2 lines 32-46, col. 18 lines 61-67 and col. 19 lines 1-25);

(c) determining existence of the input user code in a code certificate table (col. 6 lines 38-50, col. 6 lines 59-65 and col. 19 lines 35-47);

(d) if the input user code exists in the code certificate table, reading program titles associated with the user code from the code certificate table, and determining whether any program title associated with the user code is the same as the program title of a program being watched by the user (col. 19 lines 36-47 and col. 20 lines 11-27);

(e) if no same program title exists, determining whether a flag for indicating use of the same user ID and password for all broadcasting programs is set to be or not (col. 19 lines 36-47);

(f) if the flag is set to be on, reading a sequence of keys associated with for the user code from the code certificate table, wherein the sequence of keys includes a userID and a password (col. 19 lines 36-47); and

(g) transferring the user ID and password of the sequence of keys associated with the user code to a broadcasting station (col. 19 lines 36-47 and col. 20 lines 11-27).

Iwafune et al. is silent in explicitly disclosing inputting a code shortcut key on a remote control device during watching a data broadcasting (he does implicitly hint towards such an analogous element in column 18 lines 19-23), however, Sakata does disclose such a limitation (col. 1 lines 26-37, specifically lines 31-34 of Sakata).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention to combine the television system of Iwafune et al. with the communication terminal of Sakata. Sakata provides motivation for this combination in the recitation of the "since a remote controller is used as

> the main control system of each device, it is unsuitable for complicated input operation ... the operability of the input is bad." Therefore, motivation for modifying the television system of Iwafune et al. and its remote control (Figure 17) with the communication terminal of Sakata and its remote control (col. 1 lines 31-34) is clear. The shortcut key of the remote controller disclosed by Sakata would benefit the television system of Iwafune et al. in that the television remote control would be able to handled "complicated input" such as the key sequence claimed within the instant application.

Regarding claim 8, Iwafune et al., is silent in disclosing the method as claimed in claim 7, further comprising the step of displaying a message on a screen that indicates no program title associated with the user code is the same as the program title of the title being watched by the user in a case where the flag is not set to be on as a result of the determination in step (e). However, it would have been obvious to provide a non-affirmative response/message to the user if a transaction does not complete as intended. Iwafune et al. provides motivation for the obviousness modification reasoning in the recitation of col. 17 lines 62-65 in which a screen is displayed after transaction establishment information is received, which can contain either be a positive or negative message. Therefore, motivation for modifying the television system of Iwafune et al. is clear. Such a message would benefit the television system of Iwafune et al. by increasing user satisfaction - keeping users informed of the status of operations – thus making the system as a whole more user friendly.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

10. Claims 9-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Iwafune et al. (US Patent No. 5,880,720), Sakata (US Patent No. 7,110,018), and further in view of Jung (US Patent No. 6,483,553).

Regarding claims 9, 12-20, Iwafune et al., discloses a user certificate system for a data broadcasting comprising:

- a first memory for storing a code certificate table for writing a record having a user code, a program title, and a sequence of keys thereon while watching the digital TV receiver, wherein the user code is input by a user, and the sequence of keys include a user ID and a password (Figure 16 element 84);
- a second memory for storing a flag indicating whether the same user ID and password are used for all broadcasting program (Figure 16 element 83);
- a settop box having the first and second memories and capable of extracting a program title from an Electronic Program Guide table received from a broadcasting station (col. 7 lines 8-17 of Iwafune et al.); and

- a remote control device including, a code collection starting key for starting application (Figure 17 of Iwafune et al.),
- a code recollection end key for ending the application of the user ID and the password (col. 2 lines 32-46, col. 18 lines 61-67 and col. 19 lines 1-25 of Iwafune et al.).

Iwafune et al. in view of Sakata is silent in disclosing a digital TV receiver for receiving a digital TV broadcasting, however Jung does disclose such a limitation (col. 5 lines 65-67 and col. 6 lines 1-4 of Jung).

It would have bee obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention to combine the television system of Iwafune et al. in view of the communication terminal of Sakata with the TV receiver for digital/analog combined use of Jung. Jung provides motivation for this combination in the recitation, "the digital TV broadcasting systems will use channels the present analog (radio) broadcasting systems do not use, frequently. Therefore, the digital TV broadcasting signals can be received by an existing analog TV antenna. Moreover, an output frequency band of a digital tuner is also similar to an output frequency band of a tuner of an existing analog TV receiver." Therefore, motivation for modifying the television system of Iwafune et al. in further view of the communication terminal of Sakata and their remote controls with the TV receiver for digital/analog combined use of Jung is clear. The digital TV receiver disclosed by Jung is would benefit the television system of Iwafune et al. in further view of the communication terminal of Sakata in that it allows the users of the television system to receive higher quality picture and sound – thus increasing satisfaction levels. Also this modification would allow the television system communication combination to take advantage of the more modern technology of digital TV broadcasting, which will – in the very near future - become the standard form of TV broadcasting.

Iwafune et al. is silent in disclosing a code shortcut key for carrying out a user code certificate procedure by retrieving, from the code certificate table, the user ID and the password associated with the user code input by the user (he does disclose an analogous such element in column 18 lines 19-23), however, Sakata does disclose such a limitation (col. 1 lines 26-37, specifically lines 31-34 of Sakata).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention to combine the television system of Iwafune et al. with the communication terminal of Sakata. Sakata provides motivation for this combination in the recitation of the "since a remote controller is used as the main control system of each device, it is unsuitable for complicated input operation ... the operability of the input is bad." Therefore, motivation for modifying the television system of Iwafune et al. and its remote control (Figure 17) with the communication terminal of Sakata and its remote control (col. 1 lines 31-34) is clear. The shortcut key of the remote controller disclosed by Sakata would benefit the television system of Iwafune et al. in that the television remote control would be able to handled "complicated input" such as the key sequence claimed within the instant application.

Regarding claim 10, Iwafune et al., discloses the user certificate system as claimed in claim 9, wherein the first and second memories are non-volatile (col. 19 lines 36-47 and col. 20 lines 11-27).

Conclusion

11. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chinwendu C. Okoronkwo whose telephone number is (571) 272 2662. The examiner can normally be reached on MWF 9:30 - 7:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nasser Moazzami can be reached on (571) 272 4195. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

CCO

September 17, 2007

NASSER MOAZZAMI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

9/17/07